C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

AGENDA

The next meeting of the

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)

will be as follows.

Date:

Thursday, October 25, 2007

7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.

Place:

San Mateo City Hall

330 West 20th Avenue

San Mateo, California

Conference Room C (across from Council Chambers)

PLEASE CALL TOM MADALENA (599-1460) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

1.	Call To Order.	Action (Alfano)		7:30 p.m. (5 mins)
2.	Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda.	Presentations are limited to 3 mins per speaker.		7:35 p.m. (5 mins)
3.	Minutes of September 27, 2007 Meeting.	Action (Alfano)	Pages 1-2	7:40 p.m. (5 mins)
4.	Recommendation of the Transportation Development Act Article 3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Program for FY 2008/09	Action (Hoang)	Pages 3-12	7:45 p.m. (20 mins)
5.	Review and approval of the 7:00 p.m. start time for the 2008 BPAC meetings	Action (Madalena)	Page 13	8:05 p.m. (5 mins)
6.	Member Recognition	Information (Madalena)	Oral presentation	8:10 p.m. (20 mins)
7.	Member Communications	Information (Alfano)		8:30 p.m. (5 mins)
8.	Communications (for information only)		Page 14	
9.	Adjournment	Action (Alfano		8:35 p.m. (5 mins)

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

NOTE: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.

Other enclosures/Correspondence

· None.

If you have any questions regarding the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda, please contact Richard Napier at 650-599-1420 or Tom Madalena at 650-599-1460.

NOTE: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

The following BPAC meeting will be held on Thursday January 24th, 2008.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting Minutes September 27, 2007

1. Call to Order.

Chair Alfano called the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meeting to order at 7:45 p.m.

Members Attending:

Michael Barnes, Cathy Baylock, Robert Cronin, Karyl Matsumoto, Mike Harding, Marc Hershman, Mark Meadows and Cory Roay.

Staff/Guests Attending:

Tom Madalena, Rich Napier, Diana Shu, Al Meckler, Pat Giorni, Caryl Gay, Didrik Hoag

2. Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda.

None.

3. Minutes of the June 28, 2007 Meeting.

Motion: Member Baylock moved/Member Hershman seconded approval of the June 28, 2007 minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Recommendation for the FY 08/09 TDA Article 3 Program

Tom Madalena presented this item on the TDA Article 3 Program. The recommendation was for the BPAC to recommend guidelines FY 2007/2008 cycle. The BPAC may want to decide whether to have a call for projects yearly or to have a call for projects every other year. There will be approximately \$600,000 in funding per year available through the TDA Article 3 Program

The BPAC concluded that it might be a good idea to have a call for projects and cap the amount so that perhaps smaller projects could be funded.

Member Hershman motioned to have a call for projects for the FY 2008/2009 cycle with a \$100,000 cap on the amount that can be requested. Seconded by member Harding. Motion carried unanimously.

5. Approval of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map

Diana Shu presented this item on the RFP for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map. The recommendation was to approve the RFP so that staff could begin solicitations. Diana Shu presented the data that the BPAC members have provided that identifies the bicycle routes as Class I, Class II, or Class III. Chair Alfano thanked the members that put in the hard work to collect the data.

Chair Alfano requested that the colors that will be used are not those that cannot be photocopied. Chair Alfano requested that the word consultant be changed to proposer. Chair Alfano voiced his concern that C/CAG should be the owner of the rights to the completed map. The final data set in some reproducible format should be owned by C/CAG. The cost of the work will be a factor so the RFP should state that cost will be a factor as well. Facilities should be defined in the RFP. Additional or future phases should be mentioned as desirable. Cost should be added as a selection criteria. Member Cronin noted that items 10 and 11 on page 12 of the RFP are important. It is important that it go beyond the county lines. Dirt roads should be optional.

Member Baylock motioned to move forward with the RFP with the changes that were noted. Seconded by Member Hershman. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Review and approval of the 2008 BPAC meeting calendar

Tom Madalena presented the 2008 BPAC meeting calendar. Chair Alfano noted that there might be meetings that will be added if it becomes necessary. The possibility of starting the meetings earlier was discussed. It was noted that staff should bring back an action item on the agenda to review and potentially approve a revised start time for the meetings.

Member Baylock motioned to approve the 2008 BPAC Calendar. Member Cronin seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

7. Member Recognition

Tom Madalena presented this item regarding Member Brooks. Member Brooks has served three two-year terms, which is the term limit set for public BPAC members. Unfortunately, Member Brooks was unable to attend the meeting. Staff had planned to thank her and to celebrate her dedicated service on the BPAC.

8. Member Communications

Chair Alfano noted that the BPAC is deeply gratified with all of the work that Maureen Brooks has provided through the years

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date:

October 25, 2007

To:

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From:

John Hoang

Subject:

Recommendation of the Transportation Development Act Article 3 Bicycle and

Pedestrian Program for FY 2008/09

(For further information contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee accept the FY 2008/09 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program call for project letter, application form and score sheet.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Bicycle and Pedestrian project funding cycle for FY 2008/09 is estimated to be \$600,000. Exact funding amount will be provided by MTC in February 2008.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

TDA Article 3 funds are derived from the following sources:

- Local Transportation Funds (LTF), which is derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide
- State Transit Assistance fund (STA), which is derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

TDA Article 3 funds are allocated to San Mateo County each fiscal year for bicycle and pedestrian related projects. The BPAC has decided to proceed with the FY2008/09 program with approximately \$600,000 available in funds. The emphasis for this cycle will be on smaller-sized bicycle and pedestrian related projects with a maximum of \$100,000 to be awarded per project.

Once the BPAC approves the TDA Article 3 FY08/09 cycle program, the project solicitation, evaluation, and selection process will take approximately six months (from November 2007 through April 2008). A tentative schedule for the FY2008/09 process will be provided at the BPAC meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

- TDA Article 3 FY2008/09 Call for Project Letter (draft)
- C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee TDA Article 3 Application Form
- C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee TDA Article 3 Scoring Sheet

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

November XX, 2007

Subject: Call for Projects - TDA Article 3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Program for FY 2008/09

To: City or County Officials:

C/CAG is pleased to issue a "call for projects" for the FY 2008/09 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program. Agencies are invited to submit applications for pedestrian and bicycle related projects. An agency can submit up to a maximum of three (3) applications. Available funding for this cycle is approximately \$600,000. The exact fund amount will be determined by February 2008. This FY 2008/09 cycle will focus on smaller sized projects (e.g., maintenance) and funding will be limited to \$100,000 or less per project. Funds will be available to selected projects beginning July 1, 2008 and will expire in three (3) years.

Completed application along with all the required materials must be received at the C/CAG office by **Friday**, **January XX**, **2008**, **at 5:00p.m**. The application form is enclosed and an electronic version of the form is also available at the C/CAG website at http://www.ccag.ca.gov.

A workshop for all potential project sponsors has been scheduled for (Time and Date TBD) at the SamTrans Auditorium located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos. Attendance in this workshop will enhance the project sponsors chance of having their projects selected, as the workshop will provide complete and detail information on how to meet all the application requirements.

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) directly administers these funds. Your application should show how the proposed project could demonstrate one or more of the 12 objectives established by MTC. These objectives are detailed on pages 6 and 7 of MTC Resolution 875. A summary of the objectives is as follows:

- 1. Elimination or improvement of an identified problem area.
- 2. A continuous interconnected route to activity centers where it did not previously exist.
- 3. Secure bicycle parking facilities.
- 4. Provisions that facilitate bicycle/transit trips.
- 5. Maintenance of Class I bikeways or restriping Class II bicycle lanes.
- 6. Projects identified in a comprehensive local bicycle or pedestrian plan.
- 7. Enhancing bicycle or pedestrian commuting.
- 8. Supporting jurisdictions that promote safety, information, and facility maintenance.
- 9. Local support for bicycle and pedestrian projects.
- 10. Regional continuity.

- 11. Bicycle safety education.
- 12. Comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian facilities plans.

The C/CAG BPAC encourages and will give priority to funding projects that establish basic services before they give consideration to the provision of amenities and project frills.

The evaluation and selection of projects for funding will be based on the numerical score (see attached scoring sheet) after careful review of the information contained in the written application, the oral presentation of the project before the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, and/or information gathered from a site visit of the proposed project. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee will use all of these factors to create a balanced program of projects that will best meet the short and long-term needs of San Mateo County's bicycling and walking population. In developing this balanced program, consideration will be given to other factors including the size of projects, geography impacted, population served, and other relevant information. Some of the important factors that in the past have influenced whether a project received funding or not include:

- Participation of a local jurisdiction's Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Council, and/or other organizations in the proposed project. Committees that include actual consumers are strongly encouraged.
- Assurance that at least one staff or board member of the sponsoring jurisdiction has
 personally biked and/or walked the proposed project route in order to gain first hand
 knowledge of the potential hazards and challenges that might exist for the potential users
- Extent of local match provided.
- The extent to which the project provides access to high use activity centers.
- The extent to which the project addresses an important safety issue.
- The extent to which the project addresses a priority in C/CAG's Comprehensive Bicycle Route Plan or a comparable Pedestrian Plan.

Please clearly identify in your application whether the project can be implemented in phases or divided into smaller usable components in case the Committee does not want to recommend the full funding requested at this time.

The following information must be submitted for each project:

- MTC TDA Article 3 required information. This information will be embodied in a resolution from your governing body that includes certain findings by the local jurisdiction. In the past you were required to submit a separate "opinion of counsel." This new resolution format, once adopted by your governing body, will now meet all of these requirements. Instructions plus a sample resolution format and sample application form are available from the MTC website at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STA-TDA/index.htm. (The MTC application form will not be required until your project has been selected for funding by C/CAG.)
- Environmental clearance document.
- A detailed map showing project vicinity and location.

- A visual presentation describing the project (e.g., photographs, MS Powerpoint, etc.)
- Attach a brief description of your Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee and a copy of the minutes in which this Committee approved the submittal of the FY 2008/09 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 application.
- A completed C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee TDA Article 3 Application for FY 2008/09.
- Evidence that the project is eligible for funding by ensuring that the items listed in MTC Resolution No. 875, pages 1 and 2, sections a. through h. are fully addressed. Some of these items may be covered through other parts of the application packet such as the resolution from your governing board.
- Attach additional sheets as needed to address all of the criteria included in the BPAC Scoring Sheet. Also provide any information that you feel would provide a compelling justification for the funding of this project.

If the above information is not included in the application, the application will not be considered.

Applicants must submit 15 (Fifteen) copies and one (1) unbound copy of the completed application packet, including all attachments. All complete applications must be received at the C/CAG office by (Date TBD) at 5:00 p.m. Please submit applications to:

City/County Association of Governments 555 County Center, 5th Floor Redwood City, CA 94063 Attention: John Hoang

If you have questions, please contact me at 650-363-4105 or email at jhoang@co.sanmateo.ca.us. Sincerely,

John Hoang

Enclosures:

- 1. Schedule for the FY 2008/09 TDA Article 3 Program
- 2. C/CAG TDA Article 3 Application For FY 2008/09
- 3. C/CAG TDA Article 3 Bicycle/Pedestrian Scoring Sheet

C/CAG BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMMITTEE TDA ARTICLE 3 FISCAL YEAR 2008/09 PROGRAM APPLICATION

ΑG	SEN	CY:			
FU	ND:	S REQUESTED: \$ (maximum of \$100,000 pe	er project)		
PR	ROJI	ECT DESCRIPTION / OBJECTIVE:			
		,			
١.	PR	ROJECT SCREENING		-	,
	a.	CALTRANS Standards			
		Explain how the project meets CALTRANS Standa	rds.		
	b.	CEQA approval?	Yes	No 🗌	
		Date of approval			
		Note: CEQA document must be submitted with the	application).	
11.	ST	ATE OF READINESS		· ·	
	a.	Make sure that the project proposal is complete an documentation. The more complete the application score.			
	b.	Right-of-Way certification required?	Yes	No 🗌	N/A 🔲
		If required, Right-of-way Cert. completed?	Yes	No 🗌	
		Comments:			
	C.	Permits/Agreements approved? List all permits and/or agreements approved/obtain	Yes ed to date:	No 🗌	N/A 🗆

		Docun	nent			Da	te approved/ obtaine

				***************************************		2011	
		,			**		Million constructiva benefit de l'adoptivit de l'Albert de l'Alber
		Comments:					
	d.	Comment on the status of design completed.	esign of	the pro	ject, and	d indicate	e the percentage of
III.	<u>CC</u>	MMUNITY SUPPORT					
	a.	Listed as "priority project" in recommended pedestrian pl		AG Co	mpreher	nsive Bio Yes 🗌	ycle Route Plan or a No 🏻
		Plan: Page:					
	b.	Local approval by bicycle/pe	destriar	n (BPA	C) organ	ization?	
						Yes	No 🗌
		Other organized groups with needs? (examples: clubs, so citizens/public BPAC, etc)					
		citizeris/public BFAC, etc)				Yes	No 🗌
		Comment on level of suppor composition of relevant com					
	C.	Funds requested:		\$			
		Local match to be provided:		\$			
		Local match percentage	=		match p		
		¥	=		=	%	

IV. MEETS PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

a.	Does the project eliminate or mitigate the effects from an iden Yes	tified problem? No			
	Explain:				
b.	Bicycle and Pedestrian:				
	 Does the project provide access to bicycle facilities in high centers? 	use activity			
	Yes	No 🗌			
	2. Does the project provide access to pedestrian facilities in centers?	high use activity			
	Yes	No 🗌			
	Explain:				
C.	Is commute use improved by the project?	No 🗌			
	Explain:				
d.	What is the relationship of the project to more significant bicycroutes? Explain:	cle or pedestrian			
e.	e. The project is consistent with or included in the following: (Attach copy of documentation for item Nos. 1, 2, 3, & 4 as appropriate)				
	1. County or City facilities plan:	No 🗌			
	2. Circulation element of general plan: Yes	No 🗌			
	3. C/CAG Comprehensive Bicycle Route Plan: Yes	No 🗌			
	4. Pedestrian Plan equal to "e.3" above: Yes	No 🗌			
	Plan:				
	Page:				
f.	Comment on the level of local support:				

SA	FETY			
Ho	w is sa	afety improved because of the project? Explain:		
<u>OT</u>	HER I	<u>TEM</u>		
			out may be used as	
a.	Can t	the project be partially funded?	No 🗌	
	-	If "Yes", how much? Explain:		
b.	Can	the project be divided into phases?	No 🗌	
	Ļ	If "Yes", describe the different phases and cost assoc phase.	iated with each	
. <u>PR</u>	OJEC	T CONTACT INFORMATION	\wedge	
	Prima	ry Contact Person:		
	Telep	hone Number:		
	Email	address:		
	Secon	ndary Contact Person:		
	Email	remarkan erametikan anti		
	Ho OT (Th a ti a.	OTHER I (These Ite a tiebreak a. Can b. Can PROJEC Prima Telep Email	How is safety improved because of the project? Explain: OTHER ITEM (These Items are for information ONLY and will not be "scored" to a tiebreaker) a. Can the project be partially funded? - If "Yes", how much? Explain: b. Can the project be divided into phases? - If "Yes", describe the different phases and cost associations.	How is safety improved because of the project? Explain: OTHER ITEM (These Items are for information ONLY and will not be "scored" but may be used as a tiebreaker) a. Can the project be partially funded? Yes No - If "Yes", how much? Explain: b. Can the project be divided into phases? Yes No - If "Yes", describe the different phases and cost associated with each phase. PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION Primary Contact Person: Telephone Number: Email address: Secondary Contact Person:

C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee TDA Article 3 Scoring Sheet

AGENCY:	RATER:			
PROJECT:				
I. PROJECT SCREENING	8 ,			
a. Meets applicable CALTRANS standards	Yes No (No d	isqualifies	project)	
b. CEQA approval	Yes No (No disqualifies project)			
	Scale	Max Points	Points Assigned	
II. STATE OF READINESS				
a. Clear and complete proposal	0 or 3 (A zero score disqualifies project.)	3		
b. Right-of-Way Certification	0 – No 4 – Yes (Completed or Not Needed)	4	,	
c. Permits/Agreements obtained	0 – No 4 - Yes	4		
d. Project design completed	0 – No 4 - Yes	4		
	Subtotal	15		
III. COMMUNITY SUPPORT		u u		
 a. Is a "priority project" on the C/CAG adopted Comprehensive bicycle Route Plan or an equal Pedestrian Plan. 	0 – None 5 – Local Project 10 – C/CAG Project	10		
b. Local BPAC approval	0 – No Support			
AND/OR	3 5 – General Support	10		
Support from other organizations	7 10 – Strong Support			
c. Cost Sharing (Local Match as % of total requested funds)	0 – 0% match 2 – 10% match 4 – 20% match 6 – 30% match 8 – 40% match 10 – 50% match	10		
	Subtotal	30		

***	APPEND DD COD LLA COD VI CODVIVIO			
IV. I	MEETS PROGRAM OBJECTIVES		r	
a.	Eliminates or mitigates an identified problem area on a route that would otherwise provide relatively safe and direct bicycle or pedestrian travel.	0 to 10	10	
b.	Bicycle and Pedestrian			
	1. Does the project provide access to or bicycle parking in high use activity centers? (Bicycle only)	0 – No	5	*
	OR	5 - Yes		
	2. Does the project provide access to recognized pedestrian facilities in high use activity centers? (Pedestrian only)			
c.	Does the project provide for the improvement of bicycle or pedestrian commute use?	0 to 5	5	
d.	Does the project provide connection to and continuity of more significant routes?	0 to 5	5	
e.	Is the project included in a County or city facilities plan or circulation element of a general plan? OR Is it consistent with the C/CAG Comprehensive Bicycle Route Plan or an equal Pedestrian Plan?	.0 to 5	5	
f.	Is there demonstrated local support?	0 – None 2 – Little 3 – Moderate 5 - Strong	5	
		Subtotal	35	
V. S.	AFETY			
In	nproves Safety	0 – None 5 – Little 10 – Moderate 15 – Substantial 20 - Significant	20	70

	TOTAL SCORE	100		
1				

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date:

October 25, 2007

To:

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

From:

Tom Madalena

Subject:

Review and approval of the 7:00 p.m. start time for the 2008 BPAC meetings

(For further information please contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee review and approve the 7:00 p.m. start time for the 2008 BPAC meetings in accordance with staff recommendation.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The schedule for regular meetings in 2008 was approved at the September 27, 2007 BPAC meeting. There was some discussion at the September BPAC meeting regarding changing the start time for the meetings. Staff was advised to bring back the item so that the BPAC could discuss potentially changing the start time for the 2008 meetings.

ALTERNATIVES

- 1) Review and approve the 7:00 p.m. start time for the 2008 BPAC meetings in accordance with staff recommendation.
- 2) Review and approve the 7:00 p.m. start time for the 2008 BPAC meetings in accordance with staff recommendation with modifications.
- 3) No action

From:

"Mark Eliot" <mark@eliotlabs.org>

To:

"Tom Madalena " <tmadalena@co.sanmateo.ca.us>

Date:

9/21/2007 5:39 PM

Subject:

Re: September 27, 2007 C/CAG BPAC Meeting Packet

CC:

"Carole Groom" <cgroom@cityofsanmateo.org>

Hi Tom,

Thank you for adding my email message of 6/27/2007 to you and the BPAC to the packet for next Tuesday's meeting. I noticed that it was marked "for information only" on the agenda. There is a little more information that needs to be included.

For BPAC's benefit and the public record, you called me subsequently to answer the question in my email message. You told me that BPAC could approve a Bicycle Master Plan as a TDA-3 project. You also said that the scoring criteria for project proposals are biased against planning projects so it is hard for the BPAC to approve them even if they want to. So recommending a BMP project is certainly within the scope of TDA-3 if the committee members can figure out how to a score it appropriately.

During this call you told me that the only way to communicate with the BPAC is to attend a meeting. I was surprised at this and said that there must be a way to communicate in writing. For all sorts of reasons it may be impossible for a member of the public to attend a meeting on a given evening. However, that citizen might still want to testify about a particular topic. Every council, board, commission, etc. covered by the Brown Act that I know of accepts letters. After our conversation, I asked C/CAG member Carole Groom to contract you regarding this. I'm inferring from the inclusion of my email in the meeting packet that at least you will include any written information addressed to BPAC in this way in the future --including this message.

```
Sincerely,
-M
```

cc: C/CAG BPAC

On Sep 21, 2007, at 4:37 PM, Tom Madalena wrote:

```
> Good Afternoon,
```

Attached for your information is the packet for the upcoming C/CAG
 Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meeting scheduled

> for September 27, 2007 at 7:30 PM.

> Regards,

>

> Tom Madalena

> C/CAG of San Mateo County

> 650-599-1460 direct

> 650-361-8227 fax

>